

IMAC-QA Subcommittee

June 14, 2003

Meeting Minutes

Attendees: Jackie Bennett, Racine Co., Co-chair, John Haine, DHFS/DHCF/BIMA, Cochair, Bernadette Connolly, DHFS/DHCF/BIMA, Marcia Williamson, DHFS/DHCF/BIMA, Chris Elms, Dane Co., Joanne Ator, Door Co., Lorie Mueller, LaCrosse Co., Lisa Hanson, DHFS/DHCF/BHCE, Vicki Jessup, DHFS/DHCF/BIMA, Marilyn Rudd, DHFS/DHCF/BIMA, Kathy Judd, Dane Co., Mike Poma, Milwaukee Co., Lynn Rochard, Milwaukee Co., Gloria Guitan, Milwaukee Co., Rick Zynda, DHFS/DHCF/BIMA, Fay Simonini, DWD/Collections, Gene Kucharski, WAPAF/Portage Co., and Rich Basiliere, WAPAF, Outagamie Co.

Members not present: Pam Lohaus, DHFS/OSF/Southern Region, Joanne Simpson, DHFS/DHCF/BIMA, and Jacaie Coutant, Milwaukee Co.

1. Minutes from 5/12 meeting

Joanne requested additional information about the federal QC sampling process and data about food stamp participation rates. Specifically, is information about the poverty level versus rate of food stamp participation available for each county? Rick said there is information available through the UW-Extension's food security consortium. The link to their website is: <http://www1.uwex.edu/ces/flp/cfs/index.cfm>.

Another website that includes information about individuals who are potentially eligible for food stamps but are not currently participating is: <http://www.aecf.org/cgi-bin/kc.cgi?action=profile&area=Wisconsin>

Mike pointed out that in Milwaukee they compare census data to caseload data for the Milwaukee county board. Marilyn pointed out that the Food Research action council website contains current data from FNS. Wisconsin was #1 in growth- over the last five years Wisconsin's food stamp caseload increased by 50%.

2. Recommendations for IM Contracts:

Jacque has concerns with the recommendation that states a sanction pass-through for agency preventable errors could not exceed 3-5% of the IM allocation. A 3-5% budget reduction could have a significant negative impact, especially for small agencies that didn't have any sanction liability in the past. Joanne pointed out that as caseloads are increasing and IM allocations are decreasing, the state should focus on helping agencies reduce errors rather than being punitive. She said further staff reduction wouldn't address the problem. The committee consensus was to alter the recommendation to IMAC to state a maximum sanction liability of 1-5% of the agency's total IM budget.

3. Benefit recovery as a performance standard

The committee discussed benefit recovery issues, and the feasibility of including it as a performance standard in the 2004 IM contracts. Most of the discussion centered around CARES limitations, the need for policy clarification, local agency workload and the recent contractual changes in funding for the fraud program.

- CARES

Some feel the BV subsystem in CARES isn't user-friendly for determining and processing Medicaid overpayments. Currently Medicaid overpayments need to be manually calculated and then entered into CARES. If the overpayment occurred in the past or household composition changes have occurred, a worker can't always use CARES simulation to assess whether an overpayment occurred or determine the overpayment amount.

- **Policy**

It is the opinion of some attendees that there has been a lack of guidance from DHCF in regard to corrective action and benefit recovery policy and procedure. In addition, the collection of incorrect Medicaid payments is not fully supported by statutes.

- **Workload**

Most local agency workers do not consider benefit recovery (especially for Medicaid) a priority, and don't feel they have time to establish claims. Fay pointed out that in agencies with benefit recovery specialists and/or specialty units, the rates of claims establishment and collections is much higher than in counties where there aren't dedicated staff. If staff resources are devoted to benefit recovery activities, the 15% incentive can potentially increase agency revenue.

The committee had the following recommendations:

1. Expand language in 2004 contracts to clearly state expectations for corrective action and claims establishment. It was suggested that each agency be asked to establish one more claim, per worker, per month.
2. Conduct data analysis to measure current local agency performance. Marilyn will compare food stamp issuance rates with the statewide error rate to approximate how many dollars could potentially have been recovered. This information will be compared to the agency's 2002 claims establishment rate.
3. Expand statutory language so that all Medicaid client errors can be recovered.
4. Further investigate funding issues to ensure incentive payments are reinvested in the Food Stamp and Medicaid programs.
5. Develop an ad-hoc benefit recovery subcommittee to: work on improvements to training and policy materials, make recommendations for CARES enhancements, write/distribute Administrator's memo, explore options for fraud program (e.g. consortium) etc.

4. Big Ten Conference

The Big Ten Conference will take place from August 20-22 in Milwaukee. Registration packets have been sent to local agencies- there is room for 250 people from Wisconsin.

Next Meeting: July 28, 2003 - 9:00 AM to 1:00 PM